

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 currently stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, 20-24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,483,527 (Doshi). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part, receiving signaling for a voice call and processing the signaling to generate a query to a call center. The query is transmitted to the call center and a query response is received wherein the query response includes a packet address. Communications for the voice call are transferred to the call center in packets including headers having the packet address.

Doshi fails to disclose receiving a query response wherein the query response includes a packet address and *transferring communications for the voice call* to the call center in packets having *the packet address*. Doshi discloses receiving signaling for a voice call, and generating and sending a call set-up message to alert the next switch.

In the recent Final Office Action, the Examiner equates receiving a query response in claim 1 with both receiving a control instruction in the terminal adaptor (Final OA, p. 3, lines 7-9) and receiving a call complete message (Final OA, p. 7, lines 5-6). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of the prior art because neither the control instruction nor the call complete message includes a packet address.

Specifically, the control instruction in Doshi does not include a packet address for transferring communications to a call center, as required by claim 1. The Examiner asserts that the control instruction comprises a virtual circuit connection (OA, p. 3, lines 8-9). However, Doshi teaches a control instruction that merely instructs the terminal adaptor to accumulate or not accumulate data received via a particular trunk (Doshi, col. 10, lines 13-24). Doshi does not disclose how the control instruction identifies a

particular trunk. Thus, the control instruction in Doshi does not include a packet address for transferring communications to a call center, as required by claim 1.

Further, the call complete message in Doshi does not include a packet address for transferring communications, as required by claim 1. The call complete message in Doshi indicates that telephone line 70 is not busy (Doshi, col. 5, lines 39-41). Switch 220 then performs routing functions in response to the call complete message (Doshi, col. 5, lines 42-62). Doshi does not disclose that the call complete message comprises a selected trunk and trunk group address as indicated by the Examiner (Final OA, p. 7, line 5-7). Rather, CO 25 in Doshi sends a call setup message (IAM) containing identifiers identifying the trunk and associated trunk subgroup (Doshi, col. 4, lines 39-44).

Moreover, even if the call complete message in Doshi does comprise the selected trunk and trunk group address, the selected trunk and trunk group address are not a packet address as required by claim 1. The selected trunk and trunk group address are not a packet address used to transfer communications for a voice call to a call center, as required by claim 1. Rather, the selected trunk and trunk group address are mapped to VCI and VPIs using a predetermined table in the terminal adaptor (Doshi, col. 7, lines 25-28). Thus, Doshi does not disclose receiving a query response wherein the query response includes a packet address and transferring communications for the voice call to the call center in packets having the packet address.

Finally, Doshi fails to disclose generating a query to a call center and transferring communications for a voice call to a call center, as required by claim 1. The calls in Doshi travel through an InterExchange Carrier network (Doshi, col. 3, lines 45-46; and Figure 1). A call center is well-known to those skilled in the art as a call destination that handles high-call volumes and provides services for businesses and their customers. Doshi makes no mention of a call center, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, Doshi does not disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over the cited reference.

Independent claim 15 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1. While separately allowable over the art of record, the remaining dependent claims depend from otherwise

allowable independent claims. The Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 3-5, 8, 12, 14, 17-19, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,527 (Doshi). A discussion of this rejection is obviated in view of the discussion above distinguishing Doshi.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no additional fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shannon L. Silversmith/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Shannon L. Silversmith, Reg. No. 60,938
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Melissa A. Jobe
Sprint Law Department
6450 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461
Overland Park, KS 66251